

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 29-46 remain in this application. Claims 36 and 38 have been amended, claims 32 and 35 have been canceled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-28 have been withdrawn in response to the restriction requirement, but without prejudice to Applicants' right to present such claims in continuing applications. Examiner indicates claims 39, 40, 42, 45 and 46 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected species. However, Applicant's believe continued withdrawal of these claims is improper.

#### **1. Specification**

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Examiner proposes changing the title to "Extrusion Die For Making A Double-Skin Honeycomb Substrate." Applicants concur with this change. Additionally, line 3, page 14 is corrected to change "forming dies 802" to "forming dies 804." Accordingly, the objection to the disclosure is overcome.

#### **2. Claim Objections**

Claims 41 and 44 are objected to because of the following informalities: a) claims 41 and 44 are dependent on withdrawn claims. Examiner should note that claims 39, 40, 42, 45 and 46 should no longer be withdrawn in that claims 29 is allowable. Accordingly, since they are dependent on an allowable claims, they are also allowable.

#### **3. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112**

Claims 32 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 32 and 35 are canceled herein. The dependency of claim 36 is changed to depend from claim 33 and is now believed to be allowable.

#### **4. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 38 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. Claim 38 has been amended to overcome the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph issues. Claims 41 and 44 would be allowable if their dependency were changed to a dependence on a non-withdrawn parent claim. Claims 41 and 44 have been left un-amended. It is believed that claims 29 is allowable and, thus, claim 40 from which they depend is improperly withdrawn. Accordingly claims 41 and 44 also contain allowable subject matter.

Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter. Further, Applicant's believe that Examiner should have, upon allowing claim 29, continued to examine claims 39-40, 42-43 and 45-46. Applicant's now look for the rejoinder of these claims and an indication of allowability thereof.

Properly withdrawn claims 1-28 are now canceled herein.

#### **5. Conclusion**

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims (claims 29-31, 33-34, and 36-46) of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.


Applicants believe that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and

Appl. No.: 10/606,508  
Response Dated: 01/17/2006  
Reply to Office Action of: 10/17/2005

hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Randall S. Wayland at (607) 974-0463.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 17, 2006

Randall S. Wayland  
Attorney for Assignee  
Reg. No. 36,303  
Corning Incorporated  
SP-TI-03-1  
Corning, NY 14831